

The Converted Catholic

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., Editor and Publisher

"When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren."—Luke 22: 32.

Vol. XXX

MAY, 1913

No. 5

EDITORIAL NOTES

And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Me. This He said signifying what death He should die.
—John 12: 32, 33.

One of the most striking peculiarities of the Scriptures is the self-explanation so often given by way of parenthesis in very important passages. Our text is one of them. If verse thirty-two stood alone we can imagine the many interpretations that might be given by present-day heresies and the resulting confusion.

Each *ism* claiming superiority over the others, would boast that it lifts up Jesus to a more lofty position in spite of the fact that its tenets might be contrary to the whole system of Christianity.

Some would lift Him up by saying that He was a manifestation of the great Spirit of God, and as such it was impossible for Him to suffer. His sufferings were only a shadow, and to represent Him as endowed with our sensitive mortal body and subject to our human sufferings and infirmities would be an indignity.

Some would represent Him as God's Messenger sent to teach mankind, and would lift Him up by calling Him the greatest of the "masters," the foremost of all philosophers.

But Jesus manifesting Himself in an unreal, visionary body, lifted up beyond the reach of human nature, can give no comfort to the *real* sufferer seeking sympathy and counsel from some one who has passed through the valley of the shadow of death. We have often noticed that the poor man when in the presence of the rich generally expects comfort from

his purse; mere words in this case are of little value, and even the purse can give only a temporary relief. But words of comfort and encouragement from some one whose sufferings are greater than ours, they are of lasting effect.

Nor would Jesus be able to draw *all* men unto Him by His power as teacher or prophet. The majority of men are too busy with the affairs of this world to give their time to the study of prophecy or philosophy. The apostle clearly states: "This He said, signifying what death He should die." So we cannot lift Christ from the earth unless we lift Him upon the cross as the Saviour of the world. His virgin birth, His wisdom and power would remain a mystery without any explanation but for the cross. And only at the cross can all men be brought together, as all, being destitute of the grace of God, have the same need of a Saviour, without distinction of race, or social or moral condition. There Jesus is not the uplifter of a race, the teacher of a school—He is all things for all men.

In our missionary experience we have seen this proved many times. That sinner, who, burdened with his sin, has gone to the cross, and there, at its foot, has felt his burden roll away, who has washed his earth-stained garments and made them white in the blood of the Lamb; such a one thereafter has been transformed; the effect of his faith has been seen in his life. In the midst of adversity he has been quiet and patient, in the face of persecution he has been faithful unto death. Firm in the assurance of his salvation, no false doctrine could move him, just as the person who is sure of his good health never takes any interest in the advertisements of drugs.

But he who professes veneration and respect for Jesus and a certain measure of faith in Him and His teachings, yet cannot see the necessity of the cross or the atonement, may be carried away by one wind of doctrine after another, just as the sickly man, disregarding the advice of the physician, is attracted by one advertisement of patent medicine after another, and makes a trial of each to the final ruin of his health.

Dear reader, come to the foot of the cross, behold the Divine face and form, full of infinite anguish mingled with infinite love and compassion. Behold the extended arms, the wounded side,

and feel the chords of His love with irresistible attraction draw you close to that heart which throbs in sympathy with all the sufferings of humanity. There you will find the true answer to that vital question He is still putting to you and me: "Who do you say that I am?" There, with His dying love, His atoning sacrifice before you, you cannot answer, "Thou art the Prophet of God, Thou art the Teacher of men." But the confession will break from your lips, as it did from the lips of the centurion, "Truly this Man was the Son of God!" And not only this, you will be constrained to say, "Thou art the Lamb of God that takest away the sins of the world—Thou art my Saviour." Then He, who no longer hangs upon the cross, but is lifted up on high, and to whom all power is given in Heaven and on earth will draw you ever onward and upward till you are made one with Him who is one with the Father.

A PRIEST SCORES A JURY

The Father Klauder Case

Some time ago the Rev. Alexander L. A. Klauder, of Malone, N. Y., until recently a Roman priest, some of whose letters we have published in THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC, won a suit in the courts against the Roman hierarchy, in which he was awarded damages in the sum of \$15,000.

When the courts are with Rome, of course the courts are fair and just. But when the courts find judgment against Rome of course the courts are iniquitous.

At a recent banquet of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, given at Watertown, N. Y., Father M. R. Burns paid his compliments to the jury that awarded the Klauder suit. The following report is taken from the Watertown "Daily Times," Watertown, N. Y., Tuesday afternoon, March 25, 1913:

"IRISH GATHER AT ANNUAL BANQUET."

Toast Program and Dancing Also Included—Klauder Case Referred to—Rev. Father Burns Tells What Would Happen to Jurymen if Old Irish Law Were Applied—C. C. Burns Toastmaster.

"If that old Irish law, which says a jury making an unfair decision shall be given a free ride out of the country, had been

in effect in St. Lawrence County recently twelve men would have obtained a free ride to the border," said Rev. Father M. R. Burns, pastor of the Holy Family Church, at the eleventh annual banquet of the A. O. H., held in the Odd Fellows' temple Monday night. This was the first public statement he has ever made upon the verdict in the recent Father Klauder case at Canton. His words were applauded heartily by those who attended the banquet.

(Account of banquet, dance, songs and speeches, one and one-half columns.)

Rev. Father M. R. Burns, pastor of the Holy Family Church, was the last speaker of the evening.

"God made no two men alike. He made no two stars alike, and the races of men are as different as the stars. The fondness for music and the utter disregard of everything else characterizes the Italian. The polite, distinguished manner and deep respect and courtesy tells one that it is a Frenchman. The deep Christian spirit and the passionate nature are the familiar things by which the Spanish are known. The German may be told by his care and thoughtfulness. But the man who swings the club as if he owned the earth and tells the Governor how to run the State, ah! there's the Irishman. If I were in charge of the universe I would give the Irish the cross. They deserve it, because they have carried it for long years."

Here Father Burns made a brief reference to the celebrated Father Klauder case, making the remarks given in the introductory paragraph. He finished by giving the three essentials of a good Irishman. Wit and humor he regarded as one, love of truth another, and the last and greatest, loyalty and allegiance.

The song "God Save Ireland," in which every one joined, closed the banquet.

State of New York, } ss.
County of Franklin, }

Alexander L. A. Klauder, being duly sworn, says that he resides at Malone, New York; that the foregoing quotations are correct copies of a portion of a report of a banquet held in Watertown, New York, as reported in the "Watertown Daily Times," March 25, 1913.

ALEX. L. A. KLAUDER.

Sworn to before me,
this 11th day of March, 1913.

WALTER J. MEARS,
Notary Public.

[SEAL.]

THE DUTY OF PROTESTANTS

BY THE REV. R. F. HORTON, D.D.

When we turn from a study of Romanism and contemplate the bare possibility of England relapsing into the bondage and darkness which any candid study reveals, we are tempted in indignation and apprehension to use any and every means to resist the encroachments of the dreaded power. And especially the examination of the tortuous and unscrupulous means which Rome employs to achieve her ends tempts us to borrow her methods to resist her advance. But to repel force with force, injustice with injustice, cruelty with cruelty, cunning with cunning, persecution with persecution, is for Englishmen impossible. Our whole genius as a nation arises from the repudiation of these very methods. There would be no gain at all, as experience has abundantly shown, in vanquishing Rome by Roman methods, for those Roman methods are above all what we most wish to vanquish. It is the fatal, the corrupting notion that force can ever produce religion, the illusion that persecution of error ever furthers truth, the pitilessness of a triumphant dogmatism, the subtle and tortuous ways of religious propaganda, which we desire to banish from our national life and from our national religion.

Thus our modes of opposing Rome are necessarily limited by the very principle which leads us to oppose her. If we could grasp and use the arm of the State to crush her, we should deliberately abstain from that advantage. If we could save perverts from going into her fold by judicious adaptations of truth, the careful concealment of facts which might be an offense, we could not employ that bad instrument to achieve the good end. The methods of Rome achieve a momentary success, only to produce a fierce reaction and miserable failure. Signor Bartoli has told us how he was led to leave the Jesuits and the Roman Church. What opened his eyes was the discovery that the strong argument on which he had been taught to rely in his defense of the Roman position was a **forgery!**

One day in 1896, fresh from his studies, and a newly made

doctor of theology, he was induced to attempt a reply to an Anglican argument for the validity of the Anglican Church and Orders. He felt that his task was easy; he quoted a famous passage from Cyprian's *De Unitate Ecclesiae*, which demonstrated the claims of the Papacy from the Father of the third century. When this work was done, he happened to be in Germany, and showed it to a German Jesuit, who said to him: "Is it possible that you do not know that this passage is an interpolation?" The shock to this truth-seeking mind was terrific. He had actually been led to build the supreme dogma of Roman authority, not on the third-century Father, who, indeed, distinctly repudiated that authority, but on a forged interpolation, inserted into the treatise by that authority itself in order to prove its claims by that characteristic way.

Dr. Bartoli began to inquire. He found that the whole system of the papacy and the method of its defense were typified by this experience.

He has left the Church of Rome and is becoming a leader in the Protestant Church of Italy. Rome's inveterate trust in forgeries, duplicities and hoodwinkings is ultimately her betrayal. It is in this way that she produces Protestantism ever afresh. If she got rid of all Protestants to-day, she would have another batch on her hands to-morrow; truth-loving souls in her own fold would come out, choked by the stifling atmosphere of fraud and violence, determined to breathe the fresh air.

The methods of Rome must, therefore, be repudiated, deliberately and consistently repudiated. Intrigue, backstair workings, trimming, hiding inconvenient facts, giving a false emphasis to convenient facts, the employment of the civil government to promote the interests of a religious belief, the unjust disqualification or persecution of religious opponents, the use of positions of trust to insinuate a proselytizing agent surreptitiously—all these approved methods of the Roman propaganda are for us out of court. We cannot fight Rome with her own weapons. We can only use the weapons of truth; we cannot even in our warfare infringe the principles of liberty and of even-handed justness.

Directly men turn their eyes Romeward they begin the practise of deceit. Newman, even in 1833, could write to a friend: "I expect to be called a Papist when my opinions are known; but, please God, I shall lead persons on a little way, while they fancy they are only taking the mean, and denounce me as the extreme."¹ "Since I have been at home," writes Hurrell Froude, "I have been doing what I can to proselytize in an underhand way."² Guile, deception, underhand ways, are precisely what we as Protestants cannot use. We turn to the light, we stand for truth. Better Rome should win the day than that we should resist her by lying. Better the liberties of England should be lost than that the sovereignty of justice, toleration and love should be impaired.

Then, are our weapons against Rome weak and few? No; they are mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds (2 Cor. 10: 4). They are not "of the flesh," it is true, but if we will only trust to them, they are sure to succeed. Truth, liberty, justice, the living faith in the living God, the firm grasp of Christ as our Saviour and the reception of the Holy Spirit as our Teacher, Comforter, Guide—can these simple spiritual weapons prevail? Are we safe in renouncing all carnal weapons and casting ourselves wholly on truth and on God? Assuredly.

It may be said to be the function of Protestantism to-day to demonstrate the validity of these spiritual weapons, and to repudiate the errors which our Protestant fathers have made in resorting to weapons of another character. Frequently the charge is brought up against us that Calvin procured the death of Servetus. How does he differ from the pope in this method of persecution? Our reply is unhesitating. We repudiate Calvin in this matter; we do not defend him. The whole difference lies in this, that Rome, in the destruction of heretics, acts in conformity with her principles, principles which she still holds and defends. Calvin, in procuring the execution of Servetus, exhibits the survival of the bad Roman doctrine, as is not astonishing in one who was trained in the Roman Church; and it is with difficulty that

¹ Newman's "Letters," vol. 1, p. 490.
² Froude's "Remains," vol. 1, p. 322.

we throw off the under-garments of early training even when our outer garments are changed. But Protestantism, as it has come to realize its own principles, unhesitatingly condemns Calvin. The difference is vital: Rome can only cease to persecute by surrendering her fundamental principles; Protestantism must surrender its fundamental principles in order to persecute.

But in what sense are we to use **truth** as our weapon against Rome? In this sense: We must acquaint our people with the forgotten facts of the Roman Church, and with the unknown underlying principles which are so skilfully concealed in the modern propaganda as it is carried on in England. Further, we must support the Modernists in their claim to let in the light of science and criticism, to search the assumptions and dogmas of the Church.

And in this God-given task we must set truth in the forefront and follow it as a guide.

1. The truth must be told about Rome. We may acknowledge with sorrow and shame that Protestant controversialists have often been led into extravagance and violence. But is that a reason for not telling the truth about Rome? Surely not. We want our wisest, best-instructed and most charitable minds to place before the Church and the country the exact truth. We know only too well what the Catholic Truth Society says; its subtle way of representing Rome as if it were Protestant, in order to commend it to Protestants. It publishes a tract, "What do Roman Catholics Believe?" And the answer to the question is a summary of the things which Catholics believe in common with Protestants. It leaves the careless reader to conclude that the belief of Catholics is the same as that of Protestants. Truth has to answer the question: "What else do Catholics believe?" For the whole difference is made by the superadded beliefs—the belief in tradition which neutralizes the Bible, in the pope and the priest who intervene in the soul's approach to God, in the mariolatry and saint-worship which reduces the meaning and value of the soul's direct relation with Christ. Truth means in this connection the whole truth and nothing but the truth. It is our

duty to inform ourselves and our fellow countrymen of this whole truth concerning Rome.

The truth can be found; it is open to us. What Rome teaches in the encyclicals of her infallible popes can be known, just as what she teaches in the writings of her authorized doctors is open to the student. William George Ward, in his infatuated love of the papacy, wished that he might have bulls and encyclicals of the infallible pope laid on his breakfast table every morning with the "Times." The Church is an *Ecclesia Docens*—that is, she is a living voice, professedly teaching the truth of God. She told the world in 1854 that the Virgin was conceived without sin. She told it again in 1870 that the pope is infallible. She has recently, in the encyclical "Pascendi Gregis," told us how she meets the search for truth, how she deals with Catholics who surrender themselves to that search.

All this should be known in England. If, in the full light of what Romanism is, and what it teaches, and how it works, England submits to Rome, well and good. Who shall complain? But the truth about Rome must be stated and known. The perversions and concealments of the Jesuitical proselytizers must be exposed. In this way truth will make us free. I know, for instance, that if my countrymen knew as much of Rome as I do, they would not dream of going over to her, and of restoring our common country to her tender mercies.

We must take pains to bring out the exact teaching and tendency of Roman Catholicism. We must, if I may be allowed the term, rub it in. People are slow to grasp it; they cannot believe that men bearing the name of Christian can possibly believe what Catholics believe, or act as Catholics act. We must insist on it, until the country really grasps the inwardness and the outwardness of the Roman creed. It has only to be known, in a free and truth-loving community, to be rejected with the same vehemence now as it was in the sixteenth century. Rome is not better, but worse, than she was in 1525. At the time of the Reformation the Jesuits were yet in the womb of time; now they are the strongest, the dominant force, in the Roman Church. Jesuit morality, Jesuit teaching,

Jesuit wirepulling are Roman Catholicism. And for Englishmen to understand the Jesuits is to repudiate them. The spirit of England is as far removed from the spirit of the Jesuits as human nature can be divided part from part. Everything that Englishmen love and believe in, the Jesuits repudiate. Everything that Englishmen hate and loathe the Jesuits believe and practise.

For example, there has not in recent years been a more unanimous opinion in England than the condemnation of King Leopold of Belgium. He was a man whose private life was the scandal of Europe; he was responsible for that hideous régime on the Congo which England rightly described as the greatest crime in history. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, a convert from Romanism, roused the whole country to the horror of that iniquity. It is safe to say that there is not a genuine Englishman breathing who does not condemn Leopold and feel that a faith in future punishment is demanded by the necessity—if there is any moral order at all in the universe—for such a life of lust and greed and cruelty to suffer in a future world the penalty which it has eluded here. That is the sentiment of England, the sentiment of morality, the sentiment of a pure and unsophisticated human nature.

Now, how does the Jesuit, and the Church led by the Jesuit, regard the same phenomenon? Here is the newspaper account of the sermon preached by the most prominent Catholic preacher on the Sunday evening after Leopold's death: "Preaching last evening at St. Mary's E., Father Bernard Vaughan said that while drawing a veil over the private life of the late King Leopold, they might look with admiration upon much that he had done publicly for the lasting good of his people. **Belgium was an object-lesson to Europe.** He was glad that the late King had in the hour of his extremity expressed his sincere sorrow for the bad example he had given his subjects, and he died publicly confessing his belief in the Catholic Church." That is Catholicism all over. Belief in the Catholic Church covers all sins. No immorality, cruelty, brutality matters in the least as long as men believe in that Church, that mother of sins.

You draw a veil over the private life. It is an irrelevant detail that the man repudiated his wife and his children, and took to himself another woman, to whom he left his bloodstained millions. It is not worth mentioning that the man ruined more innocent girls than any man ever did since the worst of the Roman Emperors. The whole horror of that Congo régime, the millions of lives sacrificed to the man's greed, under the hypocritical pretense of civilizing and protecting the helpless natives, is quietly passed over. In the Jesuit breast it excites no condemnation, no censure. The simple narrative of what was done by Leopold is so blood-curdling that even strong men have nearly swooned in the vain attempt to read it through. But the Jesuit passes it with placid acquiescence. Leopold died publicly professing his belief in the Catholic Church. That is enough. There is nothing in Leopold's life inconsistent with that belief, nothing in the Catholic system which could restrain a man from such a life. All this he could be and do, and be a good Catholic. There is no crime or vice which is not tolerated as long as the authority of the Church is admitted. If Leopold had been a model of virtue and had become a Protestant, the Jesuit would have been roused to fury and indignation; no language would have been strong enough to denounce him, no lies would have been wrong which could misrepresent and calumniate him. But he might be the worst man that ever breathed and yet be a good Catholic. The ruined girls and the tortured and massacred natives of the Congo rise up to meet him in Sheol: "Art thou also become weak as we? Art thou become like unto us?" If there is a Hell, we know that this man is there. We are even forced to believe in Hell, that our instinct of retributive justice may be satisfied. But meanwhile, "the Church"—how could it be the Church of the Bible or the Church of Christ? — speaks smooth things. "He died publicly professing his belief in the Catholic Church." That is all that is wanted—not righteousness or goodness; not mercy or purity. No, the grossest impurity, the most unscrupulous avarice, the cruellest treatment of wife and family do not count. Belief in the Catholic Church, and that alone, is needed.

Nothing more morally corrupting than this can be conceived. A religion which makes belief in itself the one thing needful, and allows that belief to be, not the motive to goodness, but the substitute for it, is a curse to mankind. This is the religion of the Jesuits. The whole soul and conscience of this country are against it. Our duty is to show what religion is, and the fruit it bears, that the country may judge.

2. Hardly less vital is it to vindicate the truth of science and of criticism. Here we join hands with the Modernists. We do not believe that their conclusions are correct. We claim the same right to judge their opinions that we do to judge the opinions of our own scholars. We no more accept Loisy and Tyrrell than we do Cheyne and Troelsch. But we are sure that the only guarantee for truth and progress is that men should be at liberty to inquire, and to state their conclusions freely as Loisy and Tyrrell have done. If ecclesiastical censure, excommunication, and practical ruin are to fall on every one who dares to think and to utter the truth that is in him, we relapse into the darkness of the Middle Ages. It is quite certain—and the fact should be brought home to England—that if the Church secured the authority she is claiming, if she controlled the education of the country, as she seeks to do, the same mental blight would fall on England that has gone near to destroy the Latin countries. Every Protestant who goes over to Rome promotes that appalling result. Even if he retains his own freedom, and dares to speak, as Tyrrell did; even if he criticizes Rome as Lord Acton did — no Protestant controversialist ever passed such appalling judgments on Rome as Acton the historian and the Catholic did—and in some way vindicates his own conscience by such freedom of utterance, yet he throws his weight into the scale against truth and freedom, he helps to lead in the subjugators of his country.

Is there a sight in the world more pitiable than that of those noblemen and commoners of prominence who, in order as they think to save their own little souls, do what they can to bring our country under the yoke? They would destroy the liberties, the hard-won liberties, of England, and bring back

the papal tyranny, in the face of the witness of history and the actual facts of the Catholic world, in their craven desire for personal ease and deliverance from the burden of truth. Under the Roman domination science cannot flourish, criticism becomes a blunt and futile weapon. Galileo will always be forced to his humiliating repudiation. An Encyclical "Pascendi Gregis" will always be hurled at those who dare to think and to express their thoughts. We must induce men to realise the intellectual death which the Church brought upon Europe in the Middle Ages, the intellectual torpor which she brings to-day wherever she is not corrected by an overwhelming Protestant majority; we must burn into the brain of England the one fact that 120,000,000 out of the 180,000,000 Catholics in this world are illiterate. We must teach the young to see how civilizations decay where the rights of science and criticism are denied. The facts are so patent, the Church is so unchangeable, the actual leaders of Catholicism are so obscurantist, that the task is not impossible, difficult though it confessedly is.

**(To be continued.)*

* These articles and the articles published in "The Converted Catholic" in the issues of last November and December, entitled "Why Romanism Ruins a Country" by the same author, together with other papers from the pens of Dr. Horton and Mr. Joseph Hocking, are published in book form under the title, "Shall Rome Reconquer England?" The book is published in England, and we shall be happy to procure copies for any of our readers who may desire them. We shall publish the price of the book next month.

Would Use Sword

Roman Priest Says Church Has a Right to Punish Heresy.

Preaching to a huge congregation at Notre Dame, Paris, in Lent, 1912, Canon Janvier said:

"The Church may punish heretics, that is, those who separate themselves from her dogmatic teaching, and consequently from her unity. They are culprits, for they do not hold the revealed faith; they violate the sworn fealty; they are in revolt against the infallible authority; they disseminate their perversity and corrupt other souls. The Church has, therefore, the right to subdue their diabolical depravity not only by anathema, but by the sword; that is to say, by obtaining from (R) Catholic states the suppression of heretics by penalties which may extend to death."—The Sentinel, April 3, 1913.

LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS

XV.

My dear Cardinal:

From what has been said in my last letter it may easily be deduced, to quote Archbishop Whately, that "Successor in the apostolic office the apostles have none"; or, as Bishop Ryle puts it, "Strictly speaking, there is no such thing as apostolic succession"; or according to Dr. Jacob, "It is not mentioned in the Scriptures . . . it is only a fiction, invented and propagated to bolster up sacerdotal superstitions"; or according to Lefroy, "Apostolic succession is schismatical, heretical, unscriptural, unhistorical; it has no place in Christianity."

But that we may not be blamed for partiality let us continue to study the list of popes, in order to demonstrate the small respect your Church has for the truth, even in those matters in which, according to her own teaching, are involved the salvation or perdition of souls.

Alexander I. is the pope next in order, and I wish to call the attention of my readers to the fact, of which you no doubt are fully aware, Cardinal, that there is no historian able to affirm anything about him. No one knows where he came from, in what year he began to reign, nor how he came to be pope. As to his age, some say that he was not more than ten years old when he became pope, others say he was eighteen, and still others, twenty. Several decretals have been attributed to him, which all the critics to-day agree in declaring to be "crude forgeries." Yet, nevertheless, the Church obliges her subjects to venerate Alexander I. as both pope and saint. And now that we are speaking of saints, it is well to note that all the popes from St. Peter to St. Sylverius, 536, except Liberius, are honored as saints, when even the existence of the majority of them has yet to be proved by the Church; for example, St. Sixtus I. and St. Telesphorus. No historian can prove what were their real names, their family, place of birth, or the years of their pontificate.

We can say the same of St. Pius I., St. Anicetus, St. Soter, St. Eleutherus* and St. Victor. Only of St. Hyginius it is said that he was elected by *the people and the clergy*, and although we know that this reference in the Liber Pontificalis is fraudulent, nevertheless it gives us a proof that even in relatively modern times it was not considered that the election of a pope must be restricted to a college of cardinals.

In the third century we have no trace of the Investiture. It is very strange that among so many forged documents extant, said to belong to this age, in none occurs the word *consecration*, *coronation*, or *investiture*. According to the chronology of Di Bruno in his "Catholic Belief" there were fifteen popes in this century. In spite of the *obscurity of the times*, as Belarmino says, the stories we have about them would make them deserve at the hands of the present pope, if he were just, the same fate as Boniface VI., that their names should be canceled. But we will not refer to these stories, lest we be accused of likewise making use of spurious documents, and also for the reason that we are not treating now of morals nor of faith, but simply of *Investiture*. In order to prove how uncertain everything concerning these popes is, let us examine briefly the divergencies of Roman Catholic historians with regard to them. The popes belonging to this century, according to the chronologies are: St. Zephyrinus, St. Calixtus, St. Urban, St. Pontianus, St. Anterus, St. Fabian, St. Cornelius, St. Lucius, St. Stephen, St. Sixtus II., St. Dionysius, Felix I., St. Eutychianus, St. Caius and St. Marcellinus. The first doubt arises with regard to the two first popes of this century, Zephyrinus and Calixtus. Was the Apostolic See vacant for a time between their reigns or not? According to "Lives of Popes" Zephyrinus became pope in A. D. 202 and Calixtus in A. D. 219. But "Catholic Belief" assures us that St. Victor died a martyr in 203, and that Zephyrinus reigned from that year (203)

* St. Eleutherus, according to the pontifical of Damasus, died in peace in the year 194, and was buried in the Vatican. "The Modern Martyrology" and the "Roman Breviary" accord to him the quality of a martyr. His body is preserved in the Vatican, where great solemnities are celebrated in his honor. The city of Noyes also claims to possess the real body of St. Eleutherus, and celebrates his fete with great pomp.

till the year 221, when Calixtus was elevated to the papacy. Again, the "Lives of Popes" states that Calixtus died in 223. Yet there exists a decree, dated 226, attributed to him, expressly commanding that the priests, upon receiving sacred orders, make a vow of continence, and that they shall not be permitted to contract matrimony. Besides this, if we are to believe the legend concerning Calixtus, it was in 227, when he was about to finish the cemetery of the Appian Way, which bears his name, that he died a martyr. How can we reconcile such contradictions, unless, indeed, he died in 223, and by especial providence was permitted to return to earth to establish celibacy and to "build" the cemetery, and die a martyr in 227? Only thus could we explain the discrepancy, which your historians leave entirely without explanation, but modern critics have doubted the antiquity of the cemetery, and the priests have disregarded the decree of celibacy.*

St. Urban, according to "Catholic Belief," was elected pope in 227 (when, according to "Lives of Popes," he was already in the fifth year of his pontificate!) and died in 233, when Pontianus was elected. The "Lives of Popes" affirms that Pontianus was elected A. D. 230, upon the death of Urbanus, while Alzog, in the chronology he publishes, in an appendix to his "Church History" as the "*best list*" of popes, gives us the following confusion of dates: "St. Urban, 223-236; St. Pontianus, 230-235; St. Antherus, 235-236." From this it is plain to see that Urban, during his own pontificate, witnessed the death of two other popes, who, strange to say, instead of being denounced as antipopes by the Church, are venerated as true popes and their feast days celebrated as saints and martyrs!

Strange that Alzog should have been so blind! Di Bruno and Artaud have taken commendable care in their lists (although they do not agree with each other) to make the different pontificates dovetail exactly (in *most* cases, at least), without overlappings or vacancies, thus giving an appearance of plausibility which would not be questioned by the majority of readers.

No less interesting and curious is it to note the manner in

* Priests were allowed to marry until the eleventh century.

which some of these early popes are said to have been elected. Here is an example in St. Fabian, successor to St. Antherus, Pontianus, or Urban, *which?* He was elected in 240, according to "Catholic Belief," or in 236, according to "Lives of Popes," in the following manner:

Fabian was a poor peasant, and a layman, who, moved by curiosity, came to the city to see the election of the new pope. Several candidates of distinction were being discussed among the faithful when Fabian entered the church where they were assembled. Suddenly a white dove descended and hovered above his head. The faithful, upon seeing this, remembered that the Holy Spirit had descended in like manner upon Jesus at His baptism, and they unanimously exclaimed that the will of God had been manifested by this providential sign. So they acclaimed Fabian as pope, and conducted him to the papal throne without other formality than the laying on of hands. As the historian assures us, at that time the custom of the electors prostrating themselves before the pontiff and kissing his feet immediately after the election, had not yet been adopted. This certainly is a very singular way of electing a pope, and as there exists no canon which confers the vote upon a dove, I believe that Fabian ought to be canceled also for irregularity in his election.

But this is not the only time that doves have taken upon themselves the office of electing popes. Even in our own times they have dared to interfere. In the "Life of Pope Pius IX," by R. Brennan, page 71, we read that a dove rested upon his carriage when he was on his way to the conclave, and all the people acclaimed him as pope beforehand. Although we cannot vouch for the truth of the story of the dove, it is quite true that Pio Nono was acclaimed before the conclave, and we could say much about this. The conclave for the election did its work with such rapidity that it was over in forty-eight hours, without waiting for the arrival of the foreign cardinals. Indeed, why should they wait if they believed that the election was already settled; (was it by the dove?)

But to return to Fabian, how singular it is that a saint to

whom so many marvels are attributed; who, though a layman, became a pope, and at the same time Bishop of Toulouse, Narbonne, Arles, Clermont, Limoges, Tours, Paris and other churches of Gaul, should die without any record being made of the manner of his death, even the date remaining uncertain! "Catholic Belief" says that he died in A. D. 254. "Lives of Popes" and Alzog agree in fixing the date in A. D. 251. But here arises a still more serious question. There is a letter attributed to St. Cornelius, the successor of Fabian, in which is established the ecclesiastical hierarchy. Alzog, in Vol. I, pp. 392-93, quotes this letter of St. Cornelius as authentic and affirms that it was written in A. D. 250. How could he write it then, if, according to the same author, he did not become pope till A. D. 251, or according to "Catholic Belief," A. D. 254? The story of the origin of the hierarchy, therefore, like everything else connected with your Church, rests on a very movable foundation. *It rests upon the letter of a pope, dated some years before he became pope, and written some centuries afterward.* But everything about this Pope Cornelius is truly admirable. During a reign which lasted but a few months, most of which were spent in exile, this pope was able to create seven or eight bishoprics, organize forty-six parishes in Rome, create seven diaconates, seven subdiaconates, confer orders upon forty-two acolites, fifty-two exorcists, readers and hostiaries, establish houses for 1,500 widows, and many others for the poor and for cenobites. He also presided over several councils, among others the Roman Council, composed of sixty bishops, established the canons of *relapsi, caduci, sacrificati, thurificati, idolatri, libellatici, traditori*, and after all, as though the miracle were not great enough to have accomplished in the space of a few months what a person of ordinary capacity and health would have required a century to perform, that we might not doubt his sanctity, he died a martyr.

St. Lucius, his successor, was elected pope, according to "Lives of Popes" and Alzog's "Church History," in 252, when, if we were to give credit to the dates of "Catholic Belief," Cornelius was still a holy and humble priest, who lived in

retirement from the world, without a suspicion that two years later he was to be elected pope by popular acclamation. Lucius is said to have been elected in Civita Vecchia, where he accompanied Cornelius in his exile. But if, according to the authorities quoted, he was elected in 252, he could not have been successor to Cornelius if he was not elected till 254! Which is right? Of this pope also wonderful things are recounted. His pontificate was also very short. The historians, not knowing where to crowd him in, gave him only five months. Nevertheless, his works were admirably prolific. During these five months he endured two banishments. According to "Lives of Popes" he was elected while in exile in Civita Vecchia, and we do not know when he came to Rome; but the same authority informs us that, "At the commencement of his pontificate, Lucius was sent into exile, but was soon afterward recalled." Now, the only testimony we have as to his return to the Eternal City is a letter of St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, congratulating him upon his return. As the "Lives of Popes" assures us that very soon after his return to Rome he died a martyr, his correspondence with St. Cyprian must have been conducted by wireless. Here in connection with St. Cyprian and St. Lucius it is well to note that according to what may be deduced from their writings there must have existed great immorality among the clergy at that time. I do not believe in the authenticity of the manuscripts we possess, but they serve, at least, to give us a picture of the customs that prevailed in those ancient times. The "Lives of Popes" tells us that St. Lucius "ordered that the ministers of the altars should never be chosen except from among men of the purest virtue." Evidently the order was necessary because such care was not generally taken. St. Cyprian's treatise on morality is a revelation of the corruption of the priesthood.

Returning to our list, St. Stephen is another pope who ought to be canceled. Not only is there no proof that he was ever elected pope, but all the evidence would indicate that if he ever was pope he assumed the papal power himself. Seeing that you use his name so freely as an authority for what suits your purposes, it would be well, for the sake of impartiality, if you did

not omit to mention the letter of Firmilianus, Bishop of Cæsaria, to St. Cyprian, in which this bishop says of the pope: "Can we believe that this man has a soul in his body?" St. Cyprian himself calls Pope Stephen I. "Arrogant, obstinate, enemy of the Christians, defender of heretics, preferring human traditions to the divine inspirations." Naturally you will tell me that all this is apocryphal, to which I will reply that there is no reason to believe that the documents attributed to St. Cyprian, which you are constantly using in your favor, are any more authentic.

It is certain that the Church has never been able to justify this pope of the charge of having defended the Spanish heretics, Basilicus, bishop of Leon and Astorga, and Marcial, bishop of Lerida. Nor has she been able to deny that one of the councils, scandalized by the pope's conduct, sent delegates to Cyprian in Africa, demanding that these prelates be deposed. This Cyprian accomplished by convoking a council of twenty-eight prelates for the purpose. Of course, Pope Stephen then excommunicated St. Cyprian. I never have been able to understand how, in spite of their disputes and this excommunication, both should be venerated as saints. As there exists no retraction from either one it is most logical to suppose that one or the other must have been in error. Impossible that it should be the *infallible* pope; and yet, how could St. Peter let into Heaven one who was so openly opposed to his successor as St. Cyprian was? This is one of the unexplained and unexplainable *mysteries* of Mother Church.

Sixtus, Dionysius and Felix I. are also a mystery for the chroniclers, who are unable to present authentic data concerning the year in which they were elevated to the papacy, nor the duration of their pontificate. Sixtus was elevated, according to "Lives of Popes" in A. D. 257 after his predecessor, Stephen, had reigned four years, while "Catholic Belief" affirms that Sixtus became pope in 259, which year is also given as the date of Stephen's death, to whom the author concedes only *one* year's pontificate, 258-259. This discrepancy, of course, causes a divergence between the dates given to the succeeding pontiffs. "Lives of Popes" gives the reign of Dionysius as beginning

259, and Felix I., 269. But 259, according to "Catholic Belief," was the date of Sixtus' elevation, so Dionysius has to be pushed forward to 261, and Felix to 272. Alzog gives Eutychianus' pontificate one year less than the other two authorities, while "Catholic Belief" makes the pontificate of Marcellinus four years longer than either the "Lives of Popes" or Alzog.

From all this it is easy to see that if Boniface VI. has been canceled because no record exists of his investiture, all the popes we have mentioned—that is, all the popes of the first three centuries, should also be canceled, for we possess no record of their investiture, nor in many cases, as we have said before, even of their existence.

And now, Cardinal, has it never seemed strange to you that the Church, which traces back to these early popes the origin of her assumed authority, her practises, doctrines and ceremonies, and which, as we have seen, claims to be a perfect organization, should possess so many documents which she ascribes to these popes, and yet that there should exist in her archives no record of their pontificates, the origin of their families, the dates of their ascension, or of their death? Do you believe that in the history of any society of that age, although not claiming to be as *perfect* as the Roman Church, there exist the laws and decrees of a sovereign, without at the same time existing a record of his elevation to power, and, above all, the date of his death? And when we consider that the doctrine of apostolic succession, upon which all the pope's authority is based, depends upon historical accuracy, we stand amazed at Rome's audacity in asserting her arrogant claims in the face of all this uncertainty and evident fraud. No wonder it suits her policy to keep the people ignorant and subservient to her dictates, unable to study or think for themselves.

We shall not be more fortunate in our search for certainties in the fourth century. The first pope of this century is Marcellus. There exists no document which would indicate that there was any election or any special ceremony to inaugurate his pontificate. There is only a record in which it is stated that after the terrible persecution which desolated the Church the

clergy and people placed themselves in the hands of Marcellus. There is no agreement as to the date of his reign. "Catholic Belief" gives it as A. D. 304-309; "Lives of Popes," as 308-310. Novaes says that the Apostolic See was vacant for six months and twenty-four days. The best historians say that it was vacant for three years between the reigns of Marcellinus and Marcellus. The affirmation of "Lives of Popes" that he instituted twenty "titles" or parishes in Rome, consecrated twenty-one bishops, twenty-five priests and two deacons, has no historical basis. Nor has a letter attributed to him, in which he declares to the Bishop of Antioch, that the Church of Rome should be called Primate and recognized as the head of all the other churches. Novaes, although against his will, was obliged to pronounce this letter to be spurious. Still, the very existence of such a document defeats its own purpose by proving that the primacy assumed by the Church is not of such ancient origin as she would have us believe.

Fleury says (Vol. II., p. 573), "Pope Marcellus died this year after having held the Holy See one year and nearly eight months. He had been odious to many, because he was for compelling those who had *fallen* during the persecution to do penance for their crime, and the disputes on that subject led to sedition and murder." Now, if he was made pope in the year 304, as "Catholic Belief" and others would have it, and only reigned a year and eight months, he must have died in 305, or the early part of 306, and yet "Lives of Popes" says Eusebius was created pope in 310, after a vacancy in the Holy See of twenty days! Eusebius, we are told, died in the same year, 310, after a reign of four months and a few days. The place of his death is still disputed. Some say that he died in Rome, others that he died in exile in Sicily. Hence the doubts with regard to his successor, St. Melchiades or Miltiades, whose reign some say began in Sicily, and others in Rome, as there exists no record of his election. His birthplace is also in dispute. Some say that he was an African, others that he was born in Madrid, Spain.

Passing over St. Sylvester, St. Mark, St. Julius and Liberius, whose pontificates present equal uncertainties, we will proceed in our next letter to consider St. Felix II., successor to Liberius.

MANUEL FERRANDO.

MR. BRYAN HAS PYROSIS

BY DR. POLITICUS.

"Evil communications corrupt . . ." Well, no matter what they corrupt. But what have the Romanists been doing to Mr. Bryan? They gave a dinner a little while ago, and they invited Mr. Bryan. And now he has pyrosis. Pyrosis, it is said, may be symptomatic of gastric disease. This, I should judge, might result from unwise indulgence at table. Mr. Bryan did not attend the dinner in the flesh. But that makes no difference. For the "Catholic News" says he and other dignitaries were there in spirit. And the Romanists are great spiritualists. They can conjure up the spirits of their departed friends at their pleasure, and make them dance attendance upon their wishes. And then they call them saints. And why should they not, with equal facility, command the spirits of their absent living friends and entertain them at dinner and other such functions?

The Alumni Association of St. Peter's (Romanist) College of Jersey City, had a dinner on the evening of April 16th at the Hotel Astor in New York. And they invited a lot of big folk, whom they did not expect to attend, because it is always customary to do that to give the thing advertisement and character, and dignity, you know. So they invited Mr. Bryan, who is a devout Presbyterian and a heretic, doomed to perdition, whose son, we are told, attends a papal educational institution, where he may learn all about the perdition to which Mr. Bryan is consigned. But it does not matter what Mr. Bryan is, nor where he is going. All the Romanists care about him is for his value for advertising purposes and for political favor. Secretly they hate him, though that is not much of a secret, for everybody knows it. Among other pleasant well-wishes upon him, they have decreed in the edict of the Holy Tribunal of Faith* "that his wife shall be a widow, and that his children shall be *orphans*, and shall go from door to door, begging alms, and that no man shall give it them. And that they shall desire to eat and have nothing." I wonder if they are starving young Bryan in their

* For this and other following quotations from the public office of the Holy Tribunal of Faith, see "The Family Regulated by the Doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures and the Holy Fathers of the Catholic Church," sanctioned and blessed by many popes, archbishops and bishops, quoted more fully in "The Converted Catholic" of July, 1912, page 242, and of December, 1912, page 401.

school. Anyhow, part of this decree has already been fulfilled, because, on the occasion under discussion, Mr. Bryan undoubtedly desired to eat at their banquet and got nothing—except pyrosis. And as much as they value Mr. Bryan's office and dignity, when they can bring these into their service, yet they have decreed "that his days shall be few and evil, and that his goods and estates, dignities, office and benefactions shall pass into the hands of strangers." By the hands of strangers, of course, they mean their own hands. And we all well know how real mad they are because his office and dignity did not go into the hands of some Romanist of their choice. But wait! They are after him; and they'll get him yet.

As for Mr. Bryan's journeyings, they have decreed "that he shall be accursed with Lucifer and Judas and all the devils of Hell, and that these shall be his lords, and that he shall remain in their company." And so they would banquet and feast him and send him on his way rejoicing—to Hell. Oh, yes! They love Mr. Bryan and wish him much joy.

So Mr. Bryan went to the dinner—not in the flesh, but in the spirit. If it kills him they may rescue him from perdition and call him a saint. For history shows that they have been known to send a heretic to Hell by various gentle modes of torture—burning at the stake and dinners and other nice things included; and then, several centuries later, when they have discerned in him a good money-getter, they have taken him out of Hell and have canonized him and have made a saint of him and have offered him their prayers. Joan of Arc affords an illustrious example of what they *might* do to Mr. Bryan.

But to resume the narrative, he went to the dinner, spiritually, and this is what he said at table—not in the flesh, but in the spirit, for he said it under the form of a written communication, written by his hand of flesh, and I quote it as it is printed in the "Catholic News" for advertising purposes:

Mr. Bryan's message was:

"I have always had a warm spot in my heart for Jersey City citizens, particularly Democrats and those young men graduates of St. Peter's College with whom I have been fortunate enough to come in contact. I know full well their aims and aspirations, and I trust that in the ensuing year, that in the future history of your college, there will come forth just as progressive, courageous and noble graduates as those who have hitherto made their impressions in the legislative halls of the State of

New Jersey, and that their devotion to principles of sound morality will never diminish while your institution stands."

And so Mr. Bryan, the good orthodox Presbyterian, has a warm spot in his heart for St. Peter's College and for Roman education, which teaches his son that his daddy is an accursed heretic, fit company for Lucifer and Judas only. Yet, isn't it strange how Romanists like to have the friends of Lucifer and Judas at their table?

NOW, A WARM SPOT IN THE HEART is sometimes a very dangerous thing. It has wrecked the political health of many a man high in official rank; namely, Mr. Taft, for instance. It brought him to a political grave, from which there is no resurrection. And the Romanists have surely sent him to Lucifer and Judas, politically speaking.

This is a disease easily diagnosed but certainly hard to cure. As an old and experienced practitioner I know no remedy for it. The diagnosis is given as follows:

Pyrosis.—A burning sensation in the epigastrium, frequently extending up behind the sternum to the pharynx, and sometimes accompanied by the regurgitation of a watery acrid or acid fluid, is termed pyrosis. In common parlance the sensation is called "heartburn," the regurgitation "water brash."

Pyrosis is often accompanied by eructations, and, like the latter, may be symptomatic of gastric or pancreatic disease, or may be a neurosis. While it is most frequently associated with a too-acid gastric juice (hyperacidity), it may exist with a neutral reaction of the stomach contents.—Butler.

And this is what the Roman dinner, spiritually fed, did to Mr. Bryan. It gave him "*a warm spot in the heart*," or heartburn, otherwise known as pyrosis. He says so himself. And he ought to know.

Now, pyrosis may be either gastric or neurotic, and perhaps both.

If gasric, it is, of course, an affection of the stomach, arising from undue anticipation of the dinner, in the spirit.

This results in a disturbance of the nerve system, and produces a neurosis, occasioned by keen disappointment in an enforced absence from the dinner, in the flesh.

The neurosis, affecting the gray matter of the brain centres, is liable to produce a brain storm, and to disconcert the mind and to divert it to an abnormal operation, seriously perverting the judgment.

And here another of the Roman edicts of "the Holy Tribunal of Faith" may have, through the dinner-trap, caught Mr. Bryan in its snare. For Rome has decreed "that he shall lose his mind and judgment, and that his eyes shall be blinded to such a degree that the light shall be to him as darkness, and that he shall remain there in." So there is no hope for him in such a case.

Both the gastric and neurotic diseases are liable to affect the pharynx most disagreeably. And the pharynx is sympathetically associated with the organs of speech. Severe pharyngitis will disturb almost anybody's utterance. Neurosis will also dispose a man to strange and unusual utterance, so that the interpretation thereof is not always certain nor accountable.

Here we have what at first seems to be a strange case. A stanch Presbyterian approves and commends Roman education, which teaches that all Presbyterians are under the curse, and should be drawn and quartered or burned at the stake, or should be exterminated by some other equally mild and gentle process, and should finally have their rest in the comforts of Hell. But when the disease is properly diagnosed and understood the case does not seem so strange. The prospective dinner caused a gastric excitation, affecting the pharynx, and confusing the speech. It also resulted in a neurosis, which produced an abnormal operation of the mind, likewise affecting the utterance. All of which is summed up in the simple confession: "I have a warm spot in my heart," or heartburn, or pyrosis.

Ergo, Mr. Bryan was talking to the galleries, and probably did not mean all he said.

But a burning sensation in the epigastrium is sometimes accompanied by a regurgitation. Whether Mr. Bryan's warm spot has yet developed to this point is not revealed. But this consequent is likely to follow. A regurgitation is a double swallowing, a reabsorption, a rushing forth and a rushing back again. And if Mr. Bryan's heartburn should result in his political demise and send him to Mr. Taft's long abode, he will no doubt wish that he might regurgitate his utterance back. Popularly speaking, this disease is called "water brash." As such it is known among common folk merely as a

sudden or transient fit of sickness, characterized by a spasmodic pain or hot sensation. Let us hope that that is all it amounts to, and that Mr. Bryan may get over it. It may be, after all, only a sudden fit or pain, and his little speech may be only "water brash."

LIAR! LIAR!! LIAR!!!

BY SENOR COLENZO.

Calling names is childish. But there is wisdom in the child's retort:

"Sticks and stones may break my bones,
But words can never hurt me."

Our esteemed contemporary, "The Menace," has been a very naughty boy. He has been snitching on Brother Romulus. And Brother Romulus is—oh, *so* mad!! He can't do anything but just dance up and down and shake his hands, and snivel and cry, "Liar! Liar!! Liar!!!"

Yes; "The Menace" has been telling things about priests and monks and nuns, and sisters, and Houses of the Good Shepherd, and Knights and politicians, and all the little tricks and secrets of Romulus. And they are not nice things. They ought not to be told. 'Deed not! They "don't sound nice." They sometimes make "The Menace" look like a "dirty sheet." But if they ought not to be told in polite hearing, then they ought not to be at all. Ought they? And the worst part of all this "Menace" tattling is, that "The Menace" has the proof, and Romulus can't deny it. About all Romulus can do is to shake his fist and say, "Just wait 'till I get you out of school!" For I notice that Romulus is not saying or doing anything while the courts are open. Nor is he accepting any challenge before the Bench. But when school is out he hides behind a fence and yells, "Liar! liar!! liar!!!" And he will do other sneaky things, too, and worse, when he gets a chance. But he proves nothing. And the naughty "Menace" and his whole Protestant crowd are costing Romulus a lot of money here and there, with all this tattle-tale business, by cutting off his graft whenever the eyes of the people are opened. Now, just listen to Romulus crying "liar" without one word of proof or argument. It appears in a

number of the papers that Romulus puts out, and I reproduce it from "The Catholic News" of May 17th, and "The Catholic Standard and Times" of May 17th, and the "Pittsburg Catholic" of May 15th, all of which quote it from "Brann's Iconoclast."

"THE MENACE' EDITOR IS SURELY A GREAT LIAR."

"As I write, there lies before me a great pile of Walker's paper, 'The Menace,' reeking with slime, slander and falsehood, says the editor of 'Brann's Iconoclast.' They are filled with lies about priests, lies about homes of the Good Shepherd, lies about the Knights of Columbus, lies about nuns, lies about the Little Sisters of the Poor, lies about bishops, lies about archbishops, cardinals and popes, lies about Catholics in general and Catholic politicians in particular. Big lies, little lies, foolish lies, insane lies—lies livid with malice—lies beslimed by ignorance—lies shameful and shameless—lies black, blue, green and speckled—rotten lies—barefaced lies—single, double and triple jointed lies—lies distorted and twisted lies—old and new—adulterated and unadulterated lies—lies born of hate, prejudice and bigotry—domestic and imported lies—lies borrowed, stolen, invented and created by the genius of mendacity, together with every other species of damnable lies ever known on earth or in Hell, and all employed by Walker for the purpose of deceiving honest Protestants and making them hate their Catholic neighbors and friends."

Altogether, it must be estimated that the "Menace" is about forty-two different kinds of a liar. And if we reckon on the basis of the double and triple lies, the proverbial "fifty-seven varieties" may be found.

Now, wouldn't that just make "The Menace" feel sick? But I don't see any doctor's gig standing before "The Menace" door. And "The Menace" is out at play this week, just about as lively as usual. I can tell you much more about "The Menace" and all our anti-papal friends, for they are a mischievous lot. And Romulus, who hates to be called names, even by his right name, just loves to call names to others. Listen! "'The Menace,' shown to be a journalistic, venomous reptile,' 'The polecat of the press,' . . . 'the foul thing called "The Menace," 'that obscene sheet, the filthy, crawling "Menace," ' etcetera. Now, Brother "Menace," will you be good?

SPIRITUALISM IN THE ROMAN CHURCH

The following is taken from "The American Citizen" of May 24th. It is but a new edition of an old story told a thousand times in Rome. We reproduce it because it is down to date, and shows that the spiritualism of Romanism is not confined to the medieval age of ignorance and superstition, but that it holds sway in the midst of our American enlightenment of to-day:

"THEY SAW A VISION."

"A Beautiful Nun" Comes to Visit an Ex-Protestant After He Becomes Romanist and Dies.

"Irish society" in Oakland, Cal., is excited over an apparition of "The Virgin" which appeared in the room in which lay the corpse of Robert Lavery, aged seventy. The vision was seen by Miss Susie Lavery, her sister Maude and their mother. Miss Susie says:

"I wanted to be alone with father. I was bending over the casket, hoping that he would send us some message. As I looked into his face I said, 'Father, you will send me a message, won't you?' And then I don't know what strange power it was, but something impelled me to turn my gaze toward the wall of the other room.

"I saw the vision—there it was, life size—it was the most beautiful thing I ever saw in my life. I stood still and half expected it to talk, it looked so real. Why, you could count the folds in the robes.

"It was bright white and above the head rested a halo of softer light. The face was turned toward my father, and the hands seemed outstretched to him. As I stood there gazing at it my sister Maude (Mrs. Hart) came in. I said, 'Look,' and she said, 'Yes, I saw it.'

"The vision lasted from 2 o'clock until 6.30 in the morning."

The press report says:

"Thos. McGinnis, a son-in-law, was skeptical and strode toward the figure to the dismay of those present. Despite their protestations he placed his hand through it and pounded the wall at its back, but the image still remained. Then he rushed across the room and lifted the curtains, covered a mirror, closed and shut doors to see if some shadow was not reflected on the wall at the foot of the dead man's bed. When he had satisfied himself he made the sign of the Cross and rushed from the house. With hands outstretched as though in supplication the image still remained at the foot of the bed and the little group in the next room stood entranced."

"Lavery was a Protestant up to three months of his death, when his wife and daughters persuaded him to adopt the Catholic faith. He was baptized into the Catholic Church January 21st. Two Catholic sisters attended him during his illness."

Is it not wonderful how Mary will favor a Protestant who has squandered all his life of three-score years and ten in heresy up to within three months of his death, and has given her only these three enfeebled months of worship, when his mind, following the decay of the body, had doubtless become weakened in senility? Many pious Romanists, who have worshiped Mary from the cradle to the grave, and for three-score years and ten, and who have brought their wealth to her altars, have gone to purgatory without receiving any such token of her appreciation and gratitude. It seems strange that Mary's newspapers should venture to publish the account of such discrimination on her part against the faithful lest the faithful should become discouraged and find virtue in heresy. But there are many boomerangs in the papal system. As for spiritualism, it constitutes one of the strongest planks in the Roman scheme of absurdities. Whenever a treasury is low or empty, or funds are needed for a new enterprise, it is the easiest thing in the world for the hierarchy to call a dead Romanist back to life to give a vision or to perform a miracle in a play upon the gullibility of the simple, ignorant faithful, who have money to pay for such entertainment. Why should men strive to establish a new spiritualism when Roman spiritualism has been in vogue and has answered every requirement for many centuries?

W. R. C.

Services at Christ's Mission

The services at Christ's Mission have been well attended this Spring, and have been marked with deep interest. With two or three exceptions Bishop Ferrando preached every Sunday, giving two courses of lectures. The first course of sermons was upon monasticism, covering several Sundays. The second course was upon the confessional. Bishop Ferrando spent many years of his life in the office of Father Superior of Capuchin Monasteries, and he is a widely experienced confessor of unusual privileges. Few men out of the Church of Rome are as capable of speaking upon these subjects as he. He gave a narrative of

convent life not found in books, enlivening it with many an amusing anecdote of incidents that came within his personal experience.

On Sunday, April 13th, Miss Caroline Holmes, missionary to northern Syria, now on a home visit, spoke at Christ's Mission on missionary work in her field, especially among the most ignorant and superstitious of Romanists, and among the Mohammedans. There was a very large attendance, and Miss Holmes proved to be a most interesting speaker. She related stories, both sad and amusing. Her noble work has been persecuted by the strongest ecclesiastical and political influence; but under the hand of God has had signal success and victory over opposition. Driven from a small mission house because the owner, under ecclesiastical threat, did not dare renew the lease to her, and on the point of being driven from the country in consequence, she prayed earnestly for the possession of a certain large house most difficult to obtain. But because our God is mightier even than St. Rita, the "Saint of the Impossible," her prayers were granted, and she is now doing a most successful work in the most desirable place to be found in that section of the country. She is now trying to find funds in America with which to buy this house in order that she may not be driven from it when her term of leasehold expires. The purchase price is \$15,000. The offering on that day was given to Miss Holmes' work, and was four or five times greater than its usual amount.

The Rev. Dr. and Mrs. Theodore S. Pond, the parents of Mrs. Ferrando, missionaries at Caracas, Venezuela, South America, are now visiting the United States for the Summer. They spent the early part of May at Christ's Mission, and will be welcome visitors here again later in the Summer. Dr. Pond was the first Protestant clergyman upon whom Bishop Ferrando called when he left his Capuchin monastery in South America to turn his back forever upon Rome. And it was under Dr. Pond's guidance that the bishop came to the United States to prepare for the great missionary work he later established in Porto Rico.

On Sunday, May 11th, Dr. Pond preached at Christ's Mission. And again the congregation was deeply interested in the account of missionary work in priest-ridden and Rome-enslaved South America, where religion, so-called, is more barbarous than

Christian. Dr. Pond spoke for more than an hour, and we regretted when he had finished that he could not speak longer, and that we could not hear more.

Some time ago Hamilton College honored Dr. Pond with the degree he so worthily carries of doctor of divinity. But in view of his approaching visit to the States the conferring of the degree was deferred until his arrival in order that he should receive the honor at a public reception. We give Dr. Pond our heartiest congratulations. Hamilton College has honored itself in its wise disposal of this gift of honor upon the man who so well merits it.

The Rev. Dr. Collins preached on Sundays, March 30th and May 18th.

The use of our chapel was granted to the Rev. Charles C. Cook for the holding of a series of monthly interdenominational Bible conferences. The first of these conferences was held on the evening of Monday, April 21st. The chapel was crowded to its full capacity. The speaker was the Rev. Ford C. Ottman, D.D., who had for his subject "The Exaltation of Jesus." The second conference was held on Monday evening, May 19th, with another large attendance, when the speaker was the Rev. F. W. Farr, of Philadelphia, whose subject was, "Some Advent Objections Considered." Both of these addresses were most able, scholarly and interesting. A third conference will be held on the third Monday evening in June, the 16th of the month. Invitations are extended to all who are interested in Bible study.

W. R. C.

Christ's Mission Contributions

The following contributions were received for the work of Christ's Mission from April 17, 1913, to and including May 24, 1913. Kindly inform us if any names are omitted that should be included in this list:

Rev. J. D. W., \$5; Mrs. W. MacQ., 50c.; Mr. and Mrs. F. S. R., \$10; W. K. B., \$1.50; Mrs. A. W., \$1; H. F., \$1; F. W. K., 50c.; C. H. L., 25c.; Mrs. C. K., \$22; Miss J. E. T., \$10; Mrs. C. L. B., \$20; Miss H. E. S., \$25; D. E. McC., \$5; A. D., 60c.; A. M. D., 18c.; Mrs. J. W. C., \$10; Mrs. E. S. L., through Rev. D. M. S., \$5; Mrs. T. A. L., \$99.50; Miss A. B. M., 50c.; A. O. O., \$20; J. W., 50c.; Mrs. F. H. W., \$5.

BOOK NOTICES

Romanism—A Menace to the Nation

The New and Original Work*

By JEREMIAH J. (Father) CROWLEY
SECOND EDITION.

Together with his former book, "The Parochial School, A Curse to the Church, A Menace to the Nation" (two books in one).

A searchlight on the papal system—startling charges against individuals in the Roman Catholic Hierarchy, made and filed by the author and a score of prominent priests, with letters, affidavits, canceled checks, photographic proofs, etc., exposing Rome's traffic in religion, (!) sin and shame; stupendous exposures of the political influence of the Roman Catholic Church in Municipal, State and Federal Governments.

This volume recites the authentic experiences of a man who occupies the unique position of having voluntarily withdrawn from the priesthood and membership of the Church of Rome without being canonically excommunicated. Concerning Crowley and his unanswerable book Rome is as silent as the grave. Why? Because she dare not reply. However, she is secretly striving to prevent its circulation with such aid as she can command from certain employees in the Postal Service and time-serving politicians of divers church affiliations.

CROWLEY CHALLENGES ROME

I will give TEN THOUSAND DOLLARS to any person who can prove that I was EXCOMMUNICATED and that STATEMENTS and CHARGES against priests, prelates and popes, in my volume, "ROMANISM, A MENACE TO THE NATION," are untrue; and, furthermore, I will agree to hand over the plates of this book and stop its publication forever.

Will Rome accept this challenge? If not, Why not?

JEREMIAH J. (Father) CROWLEY

A Roman Catholic priest for twenty-one years

The charges in this book are either true or false; if true, the crafty, guilty Priesthood and prelacy of Rome are a living menace to decency, truth and liberty, a portentous danger to clean living and pure home life. They should be, as such, prosecuted and punished by their respective governments.

The governments of several Catholic countries have already dealt vigorously with this dread, ever-present menace to national, social and individual life. Italy, France, Mexico, Latin America generally, and Portugal have banished religious orders—monks and nuns—either wholly or partially. Other Catholic governments are making ready to follow in their footsteps.

What the governments of Roman Catholic countries have done, or are preparing to do, America, Great Britain and Germany must soon do. Why? Read this book.

If my specific charges were false, Rome surely would not hesitate to prosecute me! Why should any of the civil authorities, real or seeming allies of the Papacy, fail to take fitting action against me as a libeller?

Legal prosecution has not been, and shall not be, invoked against me; for Rome and its governmental allies know full well that my distinct, repeated and specific charges would be, before any tribunal of a free

country, not only substantiated but reaffirmed and emphasized with a hundredfold force.

Since I first turned the searchlight on priests, prelates and "princes of the Church," some of those by me specifically charged with crime have died by their own hand; some from drunkenness; others from unprintable diseases. But the majority of the surviving phalanx of accused, wicked Roman hierarchs have been promoted or otherwise rewarded for brazen criminality, accepted as "signal service" to Church and Pope! Nay, more, some of my one-time ecclesiastical co-operators and financial backers—for example, Revs. Cashman, Smyth, McNamee, Croke, Foley, et al. (see page 54 of book)—have bartered conviction for advancement and profit at the hands of ecclesiastical authorities whom they once bitterly assailed. Easy, therefore, to see why they also prefer to keep "operating" lucratively among deluded Catholics and self-seeking non-Catholics. All done, of course, for "God's greater honor and glory," with the authority, approbation and blessing (!) of "Holy Father," Pope Pius X., "Vicar of Christ," "Our Lord God the Pope," "King of Heaven, Earth and Hell."

The Vatican's policy, that of cunning, calculating guilt's systematic silence, should not be permitted to cover, even for one moment, from gaze of a confiding people the awful criminality and frightful perils confronting the nations.

Every citizen, be he Protestant, Catholic, Jew or non-church-goer, all governmental agencies should combine to rid mankind of this vile incubus of treason, corruption and organized diabolism—the Papal System.

Every man interested in the race's welfare, every lover of truth, enlightenment and liberty the world over should insist upon a stern and thorough investigation of the stupendous charges formulated and promulgated by myself and my associates, lay and clerical.

This volume will enlighten you; it will guard you, and, through you, your country, against the abominable conspiracies of ROMANISM. Many judicious readers declare this book a storehouse of incontrovertible facts. Estimating it in the same way, the Roman hierarchs fear that its dissemination will bring about a revolution in the Church of Rome, dethroning spiritual despots, great and small, uprooting ecclesiastical rapacity and diabolism forever.

This volume is printed on satintone paper, beautifully bound in purple silk, richly stamped in chaste gold on side and back.

The seventy-seven illustrations alone, with explanatory footnotes, are worth more than the price of the book.

Size, 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ x 8 $\frac{3}{4}$. 701 pages. 77 illustrations

Price, \$2 net; postpaid to any address, \$2.20.

Thousands of copies have been distributed at home and abroad, and no book ever called forth such a spontaneous and voluminous expression of praise.

Sold by "The Converted Catholic." This book should be read by all our subscribers. We will give one copy of this book, free of cost, to any of our subscribers who secure for us five new subscribers to THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC at the regular price, \$1.50 per year.

The bound volume XXIX. of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC for 1912 is now on sale. It is a handsome, cloth-bound book of 432 pages. It contains many able articles on Romanism by the best authorities. It should be in your library. Correspondents ask us many questions, the answers to which are found in this book. Price, \$1.50 at the office; sent by post, \$1.70.

"THE HAND OF GOD AND SATAN IN MODERN HISTORY"

By Albert Close, Author of "*Babylon*" and other prophetic writings.

This book traces the rise of Britain and North America into great world pioneers, to the fact that both accepted the Scriptures and circulated them among their peoples, from the Reformation onward to the present day.

France and papal Europe, under the influence of the Church of Rome, cast out and suppressed the Scriptures. These acts molded the characters of the respective nations and led on and on to the terrible Waldensians and Huguenot massacres in Europe, and to the awful retribution and the French Revolution, and finally to the triumph of Britain at the close of the Napoleon wars over these revolutionary and reactionary powers. It traces the decline of papal power right down to 1870, when the temporal power fell.

It deals also with the present dismemberment of the Turkish Empire, and shows by maps that this empire has been reduced by over one half during the last 100 years. Some splendid maps and plans reproduced from the Atlas to Alison's History of Europe show the British navy sweeping the papal navies of Europe off the sea during the Napoleonic wars, and finally the complete overthrow of Napoleon at Waterloo.

The book is a historic and prophetic study of Rev. 16. The following are the titles of the chapters: I.—The Hand of God and Satan in Modern History. II.—The Signs of the Times. Our Position in the Divine Program of To-day (Rev. 16: 12-21). III.—The Great Papal Persecutions, A. D. 1200-1871. (Illustrated with seven full-page cuts.) IV.—Retributive Character of the French Revolution. V.—The Expansion of England and Rise of Protestant North America. VI.—Napoleon Overturns the Thrones of Europe. Appendix. The Interpretation of the Book of Revelation. (Twelve pages of maps and charts.) This valuable book is published in England, and THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC is the sole American agent. The price is \$1.00 postpaid. Special terms will be made to dealers and jobbers. One copy will be sent free to any of our subscribers who secure for us two new subscribers to THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC at the full rate of \$1.50 per year.

PAUL ERRINGTON AND THE SCARLET PRINCE.

By Prof. John McDowell Leavitt, D.D., LL.D.

We have bought the entire remaining stock of this interesting novel from the pen of the late Dr. Leavitt, who was a most scholarly man, a college president and professor, and an able writer. The book is an exposure of the Church of Rome. It is a story of the Civil War and of the Roman Church. Its opening scene is upon the banks of the Potomac. Later it finds its subject in Rome. There is a glimpse of war and love in war. And there is the story of conversion to Romanism and reconversion from Romanism to Protestantism after Romanism had been seen in Rome in its true light. The stock is small. While they last they can be bought of THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC only for 75 cents a copy, postpaid. Cloth bound.

BUILD YOURSELF A LIBRARY

PREMIUMS.—We give the following books to those who want them, if they ask for them, who send us new paid subscribers. They are not given to the new subscribers, but are only for those who work for us in securing new subscribers.

For one new subscriber your choice of "Geraldine de Lisle," "The Double Doctrine of the Church of Rome," "The Escaped Nun," "Aimee's Marriage," "Political Romanism."

For two new subscribers, "The Martyr in Black," together with one of the following: "Papal Merchandise," "The Waldenses," "Paul Errington," "Babylon"; or a choice of "The Hand of God and Satan in Modern History," "St. Luke's Garden," "The Holy Gospel," "Protestant and Roman Prisons."

For three new subscribers, "The Primitive Church and the Primacy of Rome," "Foxe's Book of Martyrs," "Letters to Pope Pius X," with "The Martyr in Black," or any three of the following: "The Escaped Nun," "The Double Doctrine of the Church of Rome," "Political Romanism," "Aimee's Marriage," "Geraldine de Lisle."

For four new subscribers, "Spain from Within," Rafael Shaw; "Fifty Years in the Church of Rome," or "Forty Years in the Church of Christ," Father Chiniquy; Peru.

Substitutions may be made for other books of equal value. For a greater number of new subscribers premiums of greater value will be awarded.

PLEASE PAY YOUR SUBSCRIPTIONS

The May CONVERTED CATHOLIC comes to you late, through unavoidable delays. But you will be compensated for this delay in the earliness of the June number, which is almost complete, and which will come to you within a few days after you have received the May number.

THE CONVERTED CATHOLIC

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Specially designed for the instruction of Protestants regarding Romanism and the enlightenment and conversion of Roman Catholics to the Evangelical Faith.

BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., PUBLISHER.

331 West 57th St., New York.

Subscription per Year.....One Dollar and Fifty Cents.

To ministers and missionaries, One Dollar per year.

Ten copies to one address, One Dollar and Twenty-five Cents per year.

Single copies, Fifteen Cents each.

Sample copies in quantities of twenty or more will be sold to one person at ten cents each and mailed free to addresses sent to the publisher.

Make all checks, drafts and money orders payable to the Treasurer of Christ's Mission, 1112 Times Building, New York.

Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 W. 57th Street, New York.

The date on the address label, on the wrapper, indicates when the subscription expires. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed. Therefore no other acknowledgment will be made of the payment of subscriptions in renewal. Acknowledgment by letter is laborious, expensive and consumes much time and is unnecessary.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.